

No. 6125-PWIII(I)-77/19089.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to declare Shri Gurdev Singh, Assistant Engineer (Mechanical) of the Public Works Department (Public Health Branch), Haryana, successful in the Departmental Professional Examination held from 23rd May, 1977 to 25th May, 1977.

The 27th June, 1977

No. 6084-PWIII(J)-77/19398.—On successful completion of training, Shri Rajinder Paul Gupta is hereby appointed as Assistant Engineer (Civil) in the P.W.D. (Public Health Branch), Haryana, with effect from 29th August, 1975 (Fore-noon) in the scale of pay of Rs. 400—30—700/40—1,100.

The 28th June, 1977

No. 3792-PWIII(I)-77/18743.—Shri S. V. Narula has taken over the charge of the post of Superintending Engineer (Works) in the office of the Chief Engineer, Haryana Public Works Department, Public Health Branch, Chandigarh on 2nd May, 1977 (afternoon).

M. SETH,  
Commissioner & Secy.

#### IRRIGATION AND POWER DEPARTMENT

The 24th June, 1977

No. 4409-4PWII-77/19407.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Haryana Canal and Drainage Act, 1974, the Governor of Haryana hereby declares the Divisional Canal Officer, Rohtak Division, Western Jomuna Canal, Rohtak, to exercise the powers of sub-section (4) of section 24 of the said Act in the following cases :—

Serial Number	Name of applicant/ Name of respondent	Name of village	Date of decision of Sub-Divisional Canal Officer	Particulars
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Shri Radha Kishan, son of Shri Charinji Lal	Siri Rag	4th October, 1976	Restoration of Water course in the chak of outlet 64018-L Jind No. 5.
<i>Versus</i>				
2.	Smt. Chambeli, w/o Shri Telu	Chhaper	4th October, 1976	Restoration of W/C in the chak of outlet 1024-L Jind No. 5.
<i>Versus</i>				
3.	Shri Narotam Singh, son of Shri Jawahar Singh	Beri Khera	30th September, 1976	Restoration of W/C in the chak of outlet 6934-R Jind No. 5.
<i>Versus</i>				
	Shri Banwari, son of Shri Hazari.			
	Shri Giridhala, son of Shri Hazari			

1	2	3	4	5
4.	Shri Har Narain, Son of Shri Mam Raj,	Nirjan	15th December, 1976	Restoration of W/C in the chak of outlet 9000-R, Nirjan Mr.
<i>Shri Ram Baksh, son of Shri Mokh Ram</i>				
<i>Versus</i>				
	Shri Suraj Bhan, son of Shri Ram Narain.			
5.	Shri Pokher, son of Shri Nandu,	Julani	26th December, 1976	Restoration of W/C in the chak of outlet 8050-T Julani Sub- Division.
<i>Shri Balbir, son of Shri Pokher</i>				
<i>Versus</i>				
	Shri Maha Singh, son of Shri Giani,			
	Shri Ghaini, son of Shri Ram Lal			

The 30th June, 1977

No. 6355-2PW-II-77/19617.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (Central Act 54 of 1948) read with rule 3 of the Punjab State Electricity Board Rules, 1959, the Governor of Haryana hereby appoints with immediate effect Shri Kushalpal Singh Sarohi, son of Shri Harinder Singh, Ex MLC, Village Baruala (Rohendia), Tehsil Kaithal, District Kurukshetra as non official part-time Member of Haryana State Electricity Board for a period of five years.

P. P. CAPRIHAN,

Financial Commissioner &amp; Secy.

## LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

The 22nd June, 1977

No. 5747-5Lab-77/15420.—In exercise of the powers conferred under section 88 of the E. S. I. Act, 1948, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to exempt the following Sales representatives of M/s The Boots Company (India) Ltd., 17, Nicol Road, Bombay from the operation of the E. S. I. Act, 1948 (as amended).

Serial No.	Name of the employee	Head Qrs. Office of Sales/ medical representatives	Period of exemption under section
1.	Mr. V. K. Mehta	Hissar	30th November, 1975 to 29th November, 1976

The above exemption is subject to the following conditions mentioned below:—

- (1) The aforesaid factory wherein the employees are employed shall maintain a register showing the names and designations of the exempted employees;

- (2) Notwithstanding this exemption, the employees shall continue to receive such benefit under the said Act to which they might have become entitled to on the basis of the contributions paid prior to the date from which exemption granted by this notification operates;
- (3) The contributions for the exempted period, if already paid, shall not be refunded;
- (4) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;
- (5) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of Section 45 of the said Act, or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of :—
  - (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of Section 44 for the said period; or
  - (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
  - (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employees and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
  - (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory be empowered to;
  - (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
  - (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in charge thereof to produce to such inspector or other official and allow him to examine such documents, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
  - (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises, or any persons whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employees; or
  - (d) Make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

P. P. CAPRIHAN,

Financial Commissioner and Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 4th July, 1977

No. 6700-3Lab-77/18014.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Calar Tax 14/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 44 of 1976

between

SHRI SHIV KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S CALAR TAX,  
14/3, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/95-B-75/6882, dated 13th February, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Calar Tax, 14/3 Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Shiv Kumar to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shiv Kumar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and put in their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 11th June, 1976.

- (1) Whether the workman agreed to join duties with effect from 4th September, 1975 after his services were terminated on 4th August, 1975 and failed or declined to join duties thereafter, if yes, to what effect ?
- (2) Whether the termination of services of Shri Shiv Kumar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri Ashok Kumar Yadav, their accountant as M. W. 1 and closed their case. It was then fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as W. W. 1. The case was then fixed for arguments today. Today the parties reached a compromise. The learned representative of management stated that although the workman had settled his dispute with the management and has received a sum of Rs. 388.80 in full and final settlement and no dispute remain thereafter. He further stated that about a week ago, the workman again gave to the management in writing that he had no dispute of any kind with the management, although he could not place that writing in the file as the management got this writing after the closure of the case but he offered that in case the workman shall join duty within 10 days of today, the management is prepared to reinstate him and to pay him one months wage against back wages. This he stated only for the sake of compromise. The learned representative of the workman agreed to the statement made by the representative of the management and stated that if the workman did not join duty within 10 days of today, the workman shall not be entitled to reinstatement, nor to one months wage against back wages. I, therefore, give my award as follows :—

That in case the workman joined duty within 10 days of today, the management shall reinstate him and shall pay one months wage against back wages, but if the workman did not join duty within the above said 10 days, he shall not be entitled to reinstatement nor to any amount against back wages.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

No. 550, dated the 22nd June, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

No. 6597-3Lab.77/18016.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Sudesh Steel Industries (P) Ltd., 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 48 of 1977

between

SHRI NAPAL SINHG, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SUDESH  
STEEL INDUSTRIES (P) LTD., 14/6, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Present :

Nomo, for the workman.  
Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/2021-B-77/19566, dated 18th May, 1977, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Sudesh Steel Industries (P) Ltd., 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Napal Singh to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

Whether the termination of services of Shri Napal Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference, notices, were issued to the parties. On the date fixed, the representative of the management appeared but the workman did not appear, nor any representative of the workman appeared. The case was called on thrice on that day and the appearance of the workman or his representative was awaited upto 1.20 P.M., then default in appearance was considered. It seems that the workman was not interested to pursue his case. I, therefore, give my award as follows :—

That the workman does not seem to be interested in pursuing his case and hence it seems that there is no dispute between the parties. Further I answer the reference that the termination of the services/dismissal of Shri Napal Singh was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 546, dated the 22nd June, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated 22nd June, 1977.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6603-3Lab-77/18018.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Frick India Ltd., 13/3 Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 257 of 1976

*between*

SHRI SURJIT SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT M/S FRICK INDIA LTD.,  
13/3 MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :

Nemo for the workman.

Shri H. L. Kapoor for the management.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/46063, dated 17th December, 1976, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Frick India Ltd., 13/3, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Surjit Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Surjit Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman filed his claim statement and the management filed their written statement. The case was then adjourned for rejoinder to be filed by the workman for 26th May, 1977. On 26th May, 1977 the

representative of the management appeared but none appeared for the workman. On previous dates of hearing, once Shri Ram Murti Sharma had appeared for the workman and on the next date of hearing Shri Darshan Singh had appeared for the workman and on the 3rd adjourned date Shri Pasham Singh had appeared for the workman. None of these persons appearing for the workman had filed any letter of authority executed by the workman in their favour. On 26th May, 1977 Shri Pasham Singh representative of the workman who had appeared for the workman on 25th April, 1977 had appeared in other cases and had left after taking dates in those cases and he did not appear in this case on 26th May, 1977. On 25th April, 1977 when Shri Pasham Singh had appeared for the workman, the case was fixed on 26th May, 1977 and the said Shri Pasham Singh did not appear in this case on 26th May, 1977 although he appeared in other cases. It leads me to the conclusion that the workman is not interested in pursuing his case. All the three representatives of workman appeared on three different dates without any letter of authority by the workman and none appeared on the last date of hearing i.e. 26th May, 1977, the date being in the knowledge of Shri Pasham Singh. I, therefore find that the workman is not interested in pursuing his case. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of Shri Surjit Singh was justified and in order and that he is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 555, dated the 22nd June, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6559-3Lab-77/18020.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hotel Recess, Nehru Ground, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FRIDABAD  
Reference No. 94 of 1976

between

SHRI BABU LAL WORKMAN M/S HOTEL RECESS, NEHRU GROUND, FRIDABAD

Present.—

Neither party present.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/1013—A—76/20690, dated 17th June, 1976 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Hotel Recess, Nehru Ground, Faridabad and its workman Shri Babu Lal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Babu Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman filed his statement of claim but the management has not served. The case has been adjourned several times for appearance of the management. The management had been served but they did not appear despite service on them. Today the case was fixed for exparte evidence of the workman but neither the workman appeared nor his representative appeared, hence the case was dismissed in default. I, therefore, give my award as follows:

“That the termination of services of Shri Babu Lal was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 23rd June, 1977.

No. 560, dated 25th June, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated the 25th June, 1977.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6596-3Lab-77/18022—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Maheswari Fastners (P) Ltd 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI, NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 86 of 1976

*Between*

SHRI SHIV SHANKAR RAI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. MAHESWARI FASTNERS (P) LTD., 14/6, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD,

Present:

Nemo, for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID FD/942-B-76/18912, dated 31st May, 1976 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Maheswari Fastners (P) Ltd. 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Shiv Shankar Rai to this Tribunal, for the adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shiv Shankar Rai was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and put in their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 6th December, 1976.

Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

(2) Whether the workman raised the demand in question with the management directly as required by law ?

(3) Whether the workman concerned abandoned the services of the management of his own ?

The case was then fixed for the evidence of the workmen, on 1st April, 1977. On 1st April, 1977, the representative of the workman prayed for adjournment. Adjournment was granted and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman on 3rd May, 1977. On 3rd May, 1977 neither the workman nor his representative appeared but the court time was over, hence the case was adjourned to 2nd June, 1977. On 2nd June, 1977 also neither the workman appeared nor his representative. The workman had also defaulted in appearance on 3rd June, 1977 also. None appeared for the workman on 2nd June, 1977 also, although the representative of the management appeared on all the dates fixed in the case. I, therefore, find that the workman is not interested in pursuing the case and hence his dismissal in default. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of Shri Shiv Shankar Rai was not justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 545, dated the 22nd June, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6595-3Lab-77/18924.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Maheswari Fastners (P) Ltd., 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 38 of 1976

*Between*

SHRI SAHIB HUSSAIN WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MAHESWARI  
FASTNERS (P) LTD, 14/6, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Nemo; for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/756-D-75/3675, dated 30th January, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Maheswari Fastners (P) Ltd., 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Sahib Hussain to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sahib Hussain was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and put in their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 6th December, 1976.

- (1) Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
- (2) Whether the workman raised the demand in question with the management directly as required by law ?
- (3) Whether the workman concerned abandoned the services of the management of his own ?

The case was then fixed for the evidence of the workman, on 1st April, 1977. On 1st April, 1977, the representative of the workman prayed for adjournment. Adjournment was granted and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman on 3rd May, 1977. On 3rd May, 1977, neither the workman nor his representative appeared but the court time was over, hence the case was adjourned to 2nd June, 1977. On 2nd June, 1977, also neither the workman appeared nor his representative. The workman had also defaulted in appearance on 3rd May, 1977, also. None appeared for the workman on 2nd June, 1977, also, although the representative of the management appeared on all the dates fixed in the case. I, therefore, find that the workman is not interested in pursuing the case and hence his dismissal in default. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of Shri Sahib Hussain was justified and in order. He is not entitled to my relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

No. 543, dated the 22nd June, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6602-3Lab-77/18028 — In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Janta Steel and Metal Co-operative Society, 14/4, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 96 of 1976

*Between*

SHRI PREM NARAIN WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BABU STONE CRUSHER, GURUKUL ADENGPUR ROAD, BADERPUR ROAD, SARAI KHAJA

*Present:*

None for the parties.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/1009-A-76/20684, dated 17th June, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Babu Stone Crusher Gurukul Adengpur Road, Baderpur Road, Sarai Khaja, and its workman Shri Prem Narain to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 19 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Prem Narain was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The representative of the workman appeared but none appeared for the management. Notice was not served on the management. The process server reported that no such crusher by the name as given in the order of reference existed and some other crusher by some other name was there. So the case was again adjourned for service of notice on the management but the process server again reported the same thing. The case was fixed on 8th December, 1976. On 8th December, 1976, neither party was present. In the interest of justice notices were again sent to the parties for 7th February, 1977, and to the management by registered post with A.D. The postal authority returned the register notice undelivered. The report of the postal authority on the registered envelop is illegal. Again it was thought fit to send another notice, the date fixed was 4th April, 1977. The workman was directed to help and assist to secure the service of notice on the management. The case was again adjourned for 4th May, 1976. Again the same order was repeated. It was further ordered that in case the workman or his representative failed in getting service of the notice on the management, further proceedings as per law shall be taken. On 4th May, 1977, the representative of the workman had undertaken to secure service of notice on the management and prayed for adjournment. The case was then fixed for 3rd June, 1977. On 3rd June, 1977, neither party appeared. This leads me to the conclusion that the report of the process server was correct that the management was not in existence at his place and the crusher was closed and the workman did not take any interest in the case and in the matter of securing service of the notice on the management despite his undertaking and my directions, therefore. I, therefore, reach to the conclusion that the workman is not interested in pursuing his case. I, therefore, give my award as follow :—

That the termination of services of Shri Prem Narain, the workman concerned was justified and in order.  
He is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 547, dated the 22nd June, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6594-3Lab-77/18030.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Maheswari Fastners Private, Limited, 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad,

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 85 of 1976

*Between*

SHRI VIJAY KUMAR WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MAHESWARI  
FASTNERS PRIVATE LIMITED, 14/6, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Nemo, for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/942-B-76/18918, dated 31st May, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Maheswari Fastners Private Limited, 14/6, Mathura Road, Faridabad, and its workman Shri Vijay Kumar to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Vijay Kumar Rai was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and put in their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 6th December, 1976:—

- (1) Whether the termination of services of the workman concerned was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
- (2) Whether the workman raised the demand in question with the management directly as required by law ?
- (3) Whether the workman concerned abandoned the services of the management of his own ?

The case was fixed for evidence of the workman on 1st April, 1977. On 1st April, 1977, the representative of workman prayed for adjournment. Adjournment was granted and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman on 3rd May, 1977. On 3rd May, 1977, neither the workman nor his representative appeared but the court time was over, hence the case was adjourned to 2nd June, 1977. On 2nd June, 1977 also, neither the workman appeared nor his representative appeared. The workman had also defaulted in appearance on 3rd May, 1977 also. None appeared for the workman on 2nd June, 1977 also, although the representative of the management appeared on all the dates fixed in the case. I, therefore, find that the workman is not interested in pursuing the case and hence his dismissal in default. I, therefore, give my award that the termination of services of Shri Vijay Kumar Rai was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 22nd June, 1977.

No. 544, dated the 22nd June, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 6699-3Lab-77/18032.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Faridabad Spinning and Woollen Mills Private Ltd. Sector-24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 16 of 1977

*between*

SHRI LALA RAM, WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. FARIDABAD SPINNING AND  
WOOLLEN MILLS PRIVATE LTD., SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri Bhim Singh Yadav, for the workman.

Shri K. P. Aggarwal, for the management.

#### AWARD

By order No. ID/1873, dated 18th January, 1977, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Faridabad Spinning and Woollen Mills Private Ltd., Sector 24, Faridabad and its workman Sh. Lala Ram to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lala Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. They reached a compromise. The representative of the management stated that the management was prepared to reinstate the workman with continuity of service but without back wages. The representative of the workman agreed to the statement made by the representative of the management. I, therefore, give my award as follows :—

That the termination of services of Shri Lala Ram was not justified. He is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of services but without back wages.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated 22nd June, 1977.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 549, dated 22nd June, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 22nd June, 1947.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

Dated 22nd June, 1977.